

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

,	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
	09/763,324	06/18/2001	Gregory F. Payne	8399-007-999	5267	
	7:	7590 10/17/2003		EXAMINER		
	Pennie & Edmonds 1667 K Street NW Washington, DC 20006			DELACROIX MUI	DELACROIX MUIRHEI, CYBILLE	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	_			1614		
				DATE MAILED: 10/17/2003	, /6	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

`				
•		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
,	,	09/763,324	PAYNE ET AL.	
Office Action	n Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Cybille Delacroix-Muirheid		
The MAILING DAT Period for Reply	TE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence ac	ddress
A SHORTENED STATU THE MAILING DATE OF Extensions of time may be avail after SIX (6) MONTHS from the If the period for reply specified a If NO period for reply is specified Failure to reply within the set or	TORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THIS COMMUNICATION. able under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 mailing date of this communication. bove is less than thirty (30) days, a reply d above, the maximum statutory period wextended period for reply will, by statute, later than three months after the mailing See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	i6(a). In no event, however, may a manager within the statutory minimum of thir ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MON cause the application to become AB	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered time ITHS from the mailing date of this of BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ily. communication.
1) Responsive to co	mmunication(s) filed on 20 A	<u>1arch 2003</u> .		
2a)☐ This action is FIN	AL . 2b)⊠ Thi	s action is non-final.		
closed in accorda	tion is in condition for allowa			ne merits is
Disposition of Claims				
	re pending in the application			
	laim(s) is/are withdrav	vn from consideration.		
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>24-28</u> is/a 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/ar				
7) Claim(s) <u>7-23</u> is/ai	-			
<u> </u>	e subject to restriction and/or	election requirement		
Application Papers		oloolion roquilomonic.		
9) The specification is	objected to by the Examiner	•		
10) The drawing(s) filed	d on is/are: a)□ accep	ted or b)□ objected to by t	he Examiner.	
Applicant may not	request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeya	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11) ☐ The proposed draw	ing correction filed on	is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ d	lisapproved by the Examir	ier.
_	ted drawings are required in rep			
	tion is objected to by the Exa	aminer.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§				
,	s made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some	,—			
<u> </u>	pies of the priority documents			
•	pies of the priority documents		•••	
applicati	e certified copies of the prior on from the International Bui tailed Office action for a list of	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		Stage
14)⊠ Acknowledgment is	made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisiona	ıl application).
	n of the foreign language pro made of a claim for domesti	• •		
Attachment(s)				
Notice of References Cited (I Notice of Draftsperson's Pate Information Disclosure Stater	ent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No Informal Patent Application (PT	

Art Unit: 1614

DETAILED ACTION

The following is responsive to Applicant's amendment received March 20, 2003.

Claims 29-34 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-28 are currently pending.

The finality of the office action mailed Dec. 13, 2002 is withdrawn in view of the following new ground of rejection.

Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement received March 6, 2003 has been considered. Please refer to Applicant's copy of the 1449 submitted herewith.

New Ground(s) of Rejection

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 1. Claims 1-9, 12, 13, 15-19, 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wada et al., (submitted in the IDS of March 6, 2003).

Wada et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed. Specifically, Wada et al. teach a method of solubilizing chitosan in acetic acid and water and adding it to a solution containing phosphate buffer, tyrosinase and a phenolic compound such as phenol, p-chlorophenol, p-cresol, resorcinol, etc. Figure 2 demonstrates the color removal from reactions solutions of phenol, p-chlorophenol incubated with tyrosinase and chitosan. Please see page 304, second column, first paragraph under Chemicals; page 305, first column Incubation Conditions and Analysis to second column up to Results and Discussion.

Art Unit: 1614

The claims are anticipated by Wada et al. because Wada et al disclose reacting identical compounds in a homogenous phase solution (i.e. the chitosan is in solution with the tyrosinase and phenolic compound) using Applicant's claimed method steps.

Therefore, modification of the chitosan polymer or oligomer would be inherent.

Moreover, the claimed properties of the modified chitosan, i.e. solubility and viscosity, would also be inherent.

Claim Rejections—35 USC 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Art Unit: 1614

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 10-11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wada et al., supra.

Wada et al. as applied above. In addition, Wada et al. disclose that the pH of the reaction solution is 7. Please see page 305, first column <u>Incubation Conditions and Analysis</u> to second column up to <u>Results and Discussion</u>.

However, Wada et al. do not disclose using reaction solutions having a pH of less than about 6.5 or a pH of at least about 8. Yet, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the pH of the reaction solution because Wada et al. recognizes the significance of pH as a variable when reacting the chitosan, enzyme and phenolic compound, and one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably expect modification of pH as necessary for optimizing reaction conditions.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 24-28 are free from the prior art because the prior art does not disclose or fairly suggest Applicant's claimed method.

Conclusion

Claims 1-23 are rejected.

Art Unit: 1614

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cybille Delacroix-Muirheid whose telephone number is 703-306-3227. The examiner can normally be reached on Tue-Thur. from 8:30 to 6:00. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Mondays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marianne Seidel, can be reached on (703) 308-4725 The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-308-7924.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-

1235.

CDM

Oct. 8, 2003